

Hitting all maximum cliques with a stable set using lopsided independent transversals

Andrew D. King*

March 11, 2010

Abstract

Rabern recently proved that any graph with $\omega \geq \frac{3}{4}(\Delta + 1)$ contains a stable set meeting all maximum cliques. We strengthen this result, proving that such a stable set exists for any graph with $\omega > \frac{2}{3}(\Delta + 1)$. This is tight, i.e. the inequality in the statement must be strict. The proof relies on finding an independent transversal in a graph partitioned into vertex sets of unequal size.

Keywords: maximum clique, stable set, graph colouring, independent transversal, independent system of representatives.

1 Introduction and motivation

When colouring a graph G , we often desire a stable set S meeting every maximum clique. For example, finding such a set S efficiently is the key to colouring perfect graphs in polynomial time [11]. Proving the existence of S has also been very useful in attacking Reed's ω , Δ , and χ conjecture¹:

Conjecture 1 (Reed [10]). *For any graph G , $\chi(G) \leq \lceil \frac{1}{2}(\Delta(G) + 1 + \omega(G)) \rceil$.*

*Department of Industrial Engineering and Operations Research, Columbia University, New York. Email: andrew.d.king@gmail.com. Research supported by an NSERC Postdoctoral Fellowship.

¹ ω , Δ , and χ denote the clique number, maximum degree, and chromatic number of a graph, respectively.

No minimum counterexample G to this conjecture has such a stable set S . For if it did, it would contain a maximal stable set S' meeting every maximum clique, and we would have $\lceil \frac{1}{2}(\Delta(G - S') + 1 + \omega(G - S')) \rceil + 1 \leq \lceil \frac{1}{2}(\Delta(G) + 1 + \omega(G)) \rceil$. Since S' is a stable set, $\chi(G) \leq \chi(G - S') + 1$, contradicting the minimality of G .

Thus such a stable set S is highly desirable when attacking Reed's conjecture for a hereditary class of graphs. The proof of Reed's conjecture for line graphs [7] exemplifies the general approach: If the maximum degree and clique number are far apart, a combination of previously known results suffices. If they are not far apart, we can use the structure of line graphs to prove the existence of a stable set S meeting all maximum cliques.

Rabern [9] recently proved that if the maximum degree and clique number are close enough, we need not consider the structure of the graph class at all:

Theorem 2 (Rabern). *If a graph G satisfies $\omega(G) \geq \frac{3}{4}(\Delta(G) + 1)$, then G contains a stable set meeting all maximum cliques.*

Here we prove the best possible theorem of this type:

Theorem 3. *If a graph G satisfies $\omega(G) > \frac{2}{3}(\Delta(G) + 1)$, then G contains a stable set S meeting every maximum clique.*

To see that this is best possible, let G_k be the graph obtained by substituting every vertex of a 5-cycle with a clique of size k . Then $\omega(G_k) = 2k = \frac{2}{3}(\Delta(G_k) + 1)$, and no stable set meets every maximum clique. To prove Theorem 3 we apply Rabern's approach with a stronger final step. Rabern applies Haxell's theorem [4], which can be stated as follows:

Theorem 4 (Haxell). *For a positive integer k , let G be a graph with vertices partitioned into r cliques of size $\geq 2k$. If every vertex has at most k neighbours outside its own clique, then G contains a stable set of size r .*

To prove our theorem we need to deal with a graph that has been partitioned into cliques of unequal size. We use the following extension of Theorem 4:

Theorem 5. *For a positive integer k , let G be a graph with vertices partitioned into cliques $V_1, \dots, V_r$. If for every i and every $v \in V_i$, v has at most $\min\{k, |V_i| - k\}$ neighbours outside V_i , then G contains a stable set of size r .*

Although this is not at all obvious, it is a straightforward consequence of observations made by Aharoni, Berger, and Ziv about the proof of Theorem 4 [1].

2 Hitting the maximum cliques

To prove Theorem 3 we must investigate intersections of maximum cliques. Given a graph G and the set $\mathcal{C}$ of maximum cliques in G , we define the *clique graph* $G(\mathcal{C})$ as follows. The vertices of $G(\mathcal{C})$ are the cliques of $\mathcal{C}$, and two vertices of $G(\mathcal{C})$ are adjacent if their corresponding cliques in G intersect. For a connected component $G(\mathcal{C}_i)$ of $G(\mathcal{C})$, let $D_i \subseteq V(G)$ and $F_i \subseteq V(G)$ denote the union and the mutual intersection of the cliques of $\mathcal{C}_i$ respectively, i.e. $D_i = \cup_{C \in \mathcal{C}_i} C$ and $F_i = \cap_{C \in \mathcal{C}_i} C$.

The proof uses three intermediate results. The first, due to Hajnal [2] (also see [9]), tells us that for each component of $G(\mathcal{C})$, $|D_i| + |F_i|$ is large:

Lemma 6 (Hajnal). *Let G be a graph and $C_1, \dots, C_r$ be a collection of maximum cliques in G . Then*

$$\left| \bigcap_{i \leq r} C_i \right| + \left| \bigcup_{i \leq r} C_i \right| \geq 2\omega(G).$$

The second is due to Kostochka [8] (proven in English in [9]). It tells us that if $\omega(G)$ is sufficiently close to $\Delta(G) + 1$, then $|F_i|$ is large:

Lemma 7 (Kostochka). *Let G be a graph with $\omega(G) > \frac{2}{3}(\Delta(G) + 1)$ and let $\mathcal{C}$ be the set of maximum cliques in G . Then for each connected component $G(\mathcal{C}_i)$ of $G(\mathcal{C})$,*

$$\left| \bigcap_{C \in \mathcal{C}_i} C \right| \geq 2\omega(G) - (\Delta(G) + 1).$$

The third intermediate result is Theorem 5. Combining them to prove Theorem 3 is a simple matter.

Proof of Theorem 3. Let $\mathcal{C}$ be the set of maximum cliques of G , and denote the connected components of $G(\mathcal{C})$ by $G(\mathcal{C}_1), \dots, G(\mathcal{C}_r)$. For each $\mathcal{C}_i$, let $F_i = \cap_{C \in \mathcal{C}_i} C$ and let $D_i = \cup_{C \in \mathcal{C}_i} C$. It suffices to prove the existence of a stable set S in G intersecting each clique F_i .

Lemma 7 tells us that $|F_i| > \frac{1}{3}(\Delta(G) + 1)$. Consider a vertex $v \in F_i$, noting that v is universal in $G[D_i]$. By Lemma 6, we know that $|F_i| + |D_i| > \frac{4}{3}(\Delta(G) + 1)$. Therefore $\Delta(G) + 1 - |D_i| < |F_i| - \frac{1}{3}(\Delta(G) + 1)$, so v has fewer than $|F_i| - \frac{1}{3}(\Delta(G) + 1)$ neighbours in $\cup_{j \neq i} F_j$. Furthermore v certainly has fewer than $\frac{1}{3}(\Delta(G) + 1)$ neighbours in $\cup_{j \neq i} F_j$.

Now let H be the subgraph of G induced on $\cup_i F_i$, and let $k = \frac{1}{3}(\Delta(G)+1)$. Clearly the cliques $F_1, \dots, F_r$ partition $V(H)$. A vertex $v \in F_i$ has at most $\min\{k, |F_i| - k\}$ neighbours outside F_i . Therefore by Theorem 5, H contains a stable set S of size r . This set S intersects each F_i , and consequently it intersects every clique in $\mathcal{C}$, proving the theorem. $\square$

It remains to prove Theorem 5. We do this in the next section.

3 Independent transversals with lopsided sets

Suppose we are given a finite graph whose vertices are partitioned into stable sets $V_1, \dots, V_r$. An *independent system of representatives* or *ISR* of $(V_1, \dots, V_r)$ is a stable set of size r in G intersecting each V_i exactly once. A *partial ISR*, then, is simply a stable set in G intersecting no V_i more than once. ISR's are intimately related to both the strong chromatic number [6] and list colourings [5].

A *totally dominating set* D is a set of vertices such that every vertex of G has a neighbour in D , including the vertices of D . Given $J \subseteq [m]$, we use V_J to denote $(V_i \mid i \in J)$. Given $X \subseteq V(G)$, we use $I(X)$ to denote the set of partitions intersected by X , i.e. $I(X) = \{i \in [r] \mid V_i \cap X \neq \emptyset\}$. For an induced subgraph H of G , we implicitly consider H to inherit the partitioning of G .

To prove our lopsided existence condition for ISR's, we use a consequence of Haxell's proof of Theorem 4 [4] pointed out (and proved explicitly) by Aharoni, Berger, and Ziv [1]. Actually we prove a slight strengthening of their result:

Lemma 8. *Let x_1 be a vertex in V_r , and suppose $G[V_{[r-1]}]$ has an ISR. Suppose there is no $J \subseteq [r-1]$ and $D \subseteq V_J \cup \{x_1\}$ totally dominating $V_J \cup \{x_1\}$ with the following properties:*

1. D is the union of disjoint stable sets X and Y .
2. Y is a (not necessarily proper) partial ISR for V_J . Thus $|Y| \leq |J|$.
3. Every vertex in Y has exactly one neighbour in X . Thus $|X| \leq |Y|$.
4. X contains x_1 .

Then G has an ISR containing $\{x_1\}$.

Proof. Let G be a minimum counterexample; we can assume $G = G[V_{[r-1]}] \cup \{x_1\}$. Furthermore, $r > 1$ otherwise the lemma is trivial. Let R_1 be an ISR of $G[V_{[r-1]}]$ chosen such that the set $Y'_1 = Y_1 = R_1 \cap N(x_1)$ has minimum size. We know that R_1 exists because $G[V_{[r-1]}]$ has at least one ISR, and we know that Y'_1 is nonempty because G does not have an ISR. Now let $X_1 = \{x_1\}$ and let $D_1 = X_1 \cup Y_1$.

We now construct an infinite sequence of partial ISRs $Y_1 \subset Y_2 \subset \dots$, which contradicts the fact that G is finite. Let $i > 1$, and suppose we have sets $\{R_j, Y_j, X_j \mid 1 \leq j < i\}$ such that:

- X_j is a stable set consisting of distinct vertices $\{x_1, \dots, x_j\}$. For $j > 1$, x_j is a vertex in $G[V_{I(Y_{j-1})}]$ with no neighbour in $X_{j-1} \cup Y_{j-1}$.
- R_j is an ISR of $G[V_{[r-1]}]$ such that for every $1 \leq \ell < j$, $R_j \cap N(X_\ell) = Y_\ell$. Subject to that, R_j is chosen so that $Y'_j = R_j \cap N(x_j)$ is minimum. For $1 \leq j < i$, Y'_j is nonempty.
- $Y_j = \cup_{i=1}^j Y'_i$.

To find x_i , Y'_i , and R_i , we proceed as follows.

1. Let x_i be any vertex in $G[V_{I(Y_{i-1})}]$ with no neighbour in $X_{i-1} \cup Y_{i-1}$. We know that x_i exists, otherwise the set $D_{i-1} = X_{i-1} \cup Y_{i-1}$ would be a total dominating set for $G[V_{I(Y_{i-1})} \cup \{x_1\}]$, contradicting the fact that G is a counterexample.
2. Let R_i be an ISR of $G[V_{[r-1]}]$ chosen so that for all $1 \leq j < i$, $R_i \cap N(x_j) = R_j \cap N(x_j) = Y'_j$. Subject to that, choose R_i so that $Y'_i = R_i \cap N(x_i)$ is minimum. We know that R_i exists because R_{i-1} is a possible candidate for the ISR.
3. It remains to show that Y'_i is nonempty, i.e. that $Y_i \neq Y_{i-1}$. Suppose $Y'_i = \emptyset$. We will show that this contradicts our choice of R_j for the unique $j < i$ such that $x_i \in V_{I(Y'_j)}$. Let y be the unique vertex in $R_i \cap V_{I(x_i)}$. Construct R'_j from R_i by removing y and inserting x_i . Now for every ℓ such that $1 \leq \ell < j$, $R'_j \cap N(x_\ell) = Y'_\ell = R_j \cap N(x_\ell)$. For j , $R'_j \cap N(x_j) = (R_j \cap N(x_j)) \setminus \{y\}$, a contradiction. Thus Y'_i is nonempty.
4. Set $X_i = X_{i-1} \cup \{x_i\}$ and $Y_i = Y_{i-1} \cup Y'_i$.

This choice of X_i , R_i , and Y_i sets up the conditions so that we can repeat our argument indefinitely for increasing i , a contradiction since G is finite. $\square$

The lemma easily implies Theorem 3.5 in [1], and allows us to prove a strengthening of Theorem 5:

Theorem 9. *Let k be a positive integer and let G be a graph partitioned into stable sets $(V_1, \dots, V_r)$. If for each $i \in [r]$, each vertex in V_i has degree at most $\min\{k, |V_i| - k\}$, then for any vertex v , G has an ISR containing v .*

Proof. Suppose G is a minimum counterexample for a given value of k . Clearly we can assume each V_i has size greater than k , and that $G[V_J]$ has an ISR for all $J \subset [r]$. Take v such that G does not have an ISR containing v ; we can assume $v \in V_r$. By Lemma 8, there is some $J \subseteq [r-1]$ and a set $D \subseteq V_J \cup \{v\}$ totally dominating $V_J \cup \{v\}$ such that (i) D is the union of disjoint stable sets X and Y , (ii) Y is a partial ISR of V_J , (iii) $|X| \leq |Y| \leq |J|$, and (iv) $v \in X$.

Since D totally dominates $V_J \cup \{v\}$, the sum of degrees of vertices in D must be greater than the number of vertices in V_J . That is, $\sum_{v \in D} d(v) > \sum_{i \in J} |V_i|$. Clearly $\sum_{v \in X} d(v) \leq k \cdot |J|$ and $\sum_{v \in Y} d(v) \leq \sum_{i \in J} (|V_i| - k)$, so $\sum_{v \in D} d(v) \leq \sum_{i \in J} |V_i|$, contradicting the fact that D is totally dominating. This proves the theorem. $\square$

This extends Haxell's theorem by bounding the difference between the degree of a vertex and the size of its partition. One might hope that bounding the ratio of these by $\frac{1}{2}$ is enough, but it is not: Given V_1 of size four and $V_2, \dots, V_5$ of size two, in which each vertex of V_1 dominates one of the smaller sets, there exists no ISR [3]. Lemma 8 cannot imply such a result because in the totally dominating set $D = X \cup Y$, we have no control over the average degree of a vertex in X – it may be k . So while we know that the average degree of a vertex in Y behaves nicely with respect to the average partition size, the same is not necessarily true of X . Thus Theorem 9 gives a lopsided existence condition that is not only a useful consequence of Lemma 8, but also a natural one.

4 Acknowledgements

The author is grateful to Landon Rabern and Penny Haxell for helpful discussions, and to Robert Himmelmann for pointing out an error in an earlier

version of the paper.

References

- [1] R. Aharoni, E. Berger, and R. Ziv. Independent systems of representatives in weighted graphs. *Combinatorica*, 27(3):253–267, 2007.
- [2] A. Hajnal. A theorem on k -saturated graphs. *Canadian J. Math.*, 17:720–724, 1965.
- [3] P. E. Haxell. Personal communication.
- [4] P. E. Haxell. A condition for matchability in hypergraphs. *Graphs and Combinatorics*, 11(3):245–248, 1995.
- [5] P. E. Haxell. A note on vertex list colouring. *Combinatorics, Probability and Computing*, 10(04):345–347, 2001.
- [6] P. E. Haxell. On the strong chromatic number. *Combinatorics, Probability and Computing*, 13(06):857–865, 2004.
- [7] A. D. King, B. A. Reed, and A. Vetta. An upper bound for the chromatic number of line graphs. *Eur. J. Comb.*, 28(8):2182–2187, 2007.
- [8] A. V. Kostochka. Degree, density, and chromatic number of graphs. *Metody Diskret. Analiz. (In Russian)*, 35:45–70, 1980.
- [9] L. Rabern. On hitting all maximum cliques with an independent set. *Arxiv preprint arXiv:0907.3705*, 2009. Submitted.
- [10] B. A. Reed. ω , Δ , and χ . *J. Graph Theory*, 27:177–212, 1998.
- [11] B. A. Reed. A gentle introduction to semi-definite programming. In J. L. Ramírez Alfonsín and B. A. Reed, editors, *Perfect Graphs*, chapter 11. Wiley, 2001.